



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sections treat of the constructions of the accusative with the participle, the *nomen agentis*, the *nomen actionis*, the preposition, etc., of the accusative as adverb, the etymological (cognate) accusative (as *dranti arkām arkīṇas*), and the double accusative (*vēda tvām devām*). The work brings us to a stricter and more certain solution of many questions of Vedic grammar and exegesis which hitherto were loosely or carelessly answered.

M. E. Senart presented to the *Académie des Inscriptions*, January 23, 1880, a paper on the inscriptions of Aṣoka. He showed the importance of epigraphics for the history of India, where fixed chronological dates are so rare, and gave a sketch of the discovery and decipherment of these edicts, and promised a new translation of some of them.

CHARLES R. LANMAN.

Richard Bentley's Emendationen zum Plautus aus seinen Handexemplaren der Ausgaben von Pareus (1623) und Camerarius-Fabricius (1558) ausgezogen und zum ersten Male herausgegeben von L. A. PAUL SCHROEDER. London, 1880.

The same Emendations appear in the Appendix to a Critical Edition of the *Captivi* by Edward A. Sonnenschein. London, Sonnenschein & Allen, 1880.

Not many years ago, in reading a rather turgid panegyric of Shakespeare contained in one of our American manuals of English literature, we were startled by this comment: "Yet Shakespeare was but a half man, rarely looking beyond the uses of the theatre. Prince of dramatists, master of the revels to all mankind, chief caterer to human amusement—this is something; it is even noble. But it is not enough. Great intellectual, moral, and political movements are in progress in England and on the Continent during the whole of his career. Shall not the most consummate of artists play the man?" Almost as great was the shock received from the following paragraph in Monk's *Life of Bentley*, Vol. II, p. 418: "In such a line (*i. e.*, in the maintenance of truth and refutation of sophistry) he would have exercised his learning, acuteness and powers of application with far more benefit to mankind, than in that conjectural criticism, which should have been his sport and amusement rather than the serious and staple occupation of a genius like Bentley's. In this favorite pursuit he employed his ingenuity and quickness often at the expense of sound judgment and correct taste, and his learning was too much employed in defending the fanciful alterations of the text of a Latin poet, when it ought to have been devoted to maintain and illustrate truth."

Time was when sentiments of this sort would have met with the cordial approval of most American scholars. Why give so much attention to the various readings of the codices? why so much time to mere verbal criticism, and to balancing the claims of one reading above another? why rack one's brain to bring sense into a text manifestly corrupt? Why, indeed, unless here too there is an element of truth involved? Of the prejudice, founded or unfounded, still existing in England against the exercise of conjectural emendation, evidence enough may be seen in the paucity of critical editions which have appeared there of late. Take, for instance, Plautus. If we except

Ramsay's edition of the *Mostellaria*, and the *Aulularia* of Wagner (by the way, not an Englishman), since the inauguration by Ritschl of a new era of Plautine study, no creditable edition of a single play of Plautus with critical apparatus had appeared in England, up to the present edition of the *Captivi* by Mr. Sonnenschein, whose name to the uninitiated has a very German ring, though Herr Schroeder is pleased to call him an Englishman. It is the Germans to whom we are still indebted for most that is valuable in Plautine criticism, and to Germans belongs the honor of having first called attention to the marginal notes made by Bentley in his hand-copies of classical authors now in the possession of the British Museum. Zangemeister some two years since, in the *Rheinisches Museum*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 462, pointed out the fact that these volumes contained a goodly number of emendations to various authors which had never appeared in print. Of these Zangemeister abundantly proved the critical value by giving a list of the emendations to Nonius Marcellus and to Ammianus Marcellinus, of which latter author Bentley had projected an edition, nor could any one doubt for a moment that even the cursory notes of so illustrious a scholar would yield something more than chaff. Herr Schroeder seems to have been prompted by the article of Zangemeister to undertake the collection of all the emendations of Bentley yet unpublished. In pursuance of this design he has given us, in three *lieferungen* issued in London, Birmingham, and Heilbronn respectively, the emendations to Plautus found in Bentley's copies of the well-known Pareus edition of 1623, and that of Camerarius 1558. The remaining parts, which are to contain Bentley's emendations to Plautus found elsewhere, as well as emendations to Boetius, Gellius, Persius, Juvenalis, Macrobius, Capella, Catullus, Vergilius, Cicero, Valerius Maximus and Velleius Paterculus we have not yet received. Mr. Sonnenschein seems to have had from the first a less comprehensive plan, that of giving in the concise possible fashion the emendations to Plautus alone, in his Appendix to the *Captivi*. It was perhaps only natural that a philological unpleasantness should arise between them, from the endeavor of each to get the prior right to the use of Bentley's books, and the prior right also to publication. We need not enter into their mutual recriminations of unfairness, but may esteem ourselves fortunate in having two collections of the same emendations, one of which may serve as a check upon the other, that of Schroeder being distinguished by the most painstaking German *akribie* in the reproduction of Bentley's system of critical signs, and so for scholars far more satisfactory; that of Sonnenschein being for speedy reference much more convenient, inasmuch as it records results only. The discrepancies between the two are far less numerous than might be expected. We have noticed the following: Sonnenschein omits the emendations given by Schroeder to Rud. 577, *pluvit* (i. e. read pluit); 1302, *namque quidem* (i. e. omit que); Stich. 760, *cantationem* (i. e. cantionem, so Nonius); Pseud. 1247, *tacentem* [*jacentem*]. To Asin. 649 Schroeder gives L.E. ^[Jam leg.] *Oscultate*. Aus-MS.; Sonnenschein gives simply *jam oscultate*. To Cist. II 1, 30, Schroeder gives *responsus* as Bentley's emendation, Sonnenschein *responsas*. To Cist. II 1, 56, Schroeder omits to notice that the *et* of *leget* is underlined. To Poen. I 1, 9, *atque edepol* *ἄλλοι ἄλλοι*, Sonnenschein adds MS. *haede collyraelire*, which Schroeder omits. To Poen. V 2, 8, Sonnenschein represents Bentley as first substituting for *horum hominum mihi, horum hominum*

and then withdrawing it. Schroeder makes him simply omit the *mihī*. Other differences will be noticed in the course of this article.

But let us proceed to indicate the character of the emendations themselves. Quite a large number had already been given by Bentley in his editions of Horace and Terence. Many of them consist simply in the deleting of a letter or syllable; others in the transposition or omission of words to improve the metre. Some of these changes do not call for the exercise of the highest critical ability, and a large part of them having been proposed and inserted in the text by critics of Plautus since Bentley's time, are not new to scholars of to-day. Not a few indeed are to be found in earlier editions, and from these Bentley, for aught we know, may have adopted them, as it was not his practice specially to distinguish emendations thus received. It is, however, oftentimes a matter of interest to note what view Bentley took of the conjectures of his predecessors, and how frequently he has anticipated the readings of the Ambrosianus as well as the conjectures of critics based on far better collations of MSS. than those to which he had access. No doubt Hermann and Ritschl would have taken delight in knowing that the great master, in whose school they learnt, had proposed the same remedies for the text which had independently occurred to them, and Fleckeisen, Seyffert, Studemund and Luchs will experience no less satisfaction in ascertaining that very recent conjectures of their own were made by Bentley more than a century ago. A mere underscoring of Bentley's indicating his suspicion of a word, may give us pause. Thus Merc. 66, the MSS. BCDF give *positum visere*. Bentley underscores *positum*, for which Ritschl has substituted *solitum*. In line 6 of the Prologue, where Pareus read *Eadem Latine Mercator Marci Accij*, a little cross of Bentley's indicates hesitation about receiving *Accij*. In his commentary on Terence's Phormio, Prol. 29, he quotes the line thus: *Eadem Latine Mercator Mactici*, which is the reading of B. Of Ritschl's brilliant proof of Plautus' real name he surely would not have been as obstinately incredulous as Geppert and Valauri. In the following passages Bentley anticipated readings of the Ambrosianus now generally accepted. Bacch. 500, *inimiciorem* for *inimitiorem*. Cas. IV 1, 18 (644), *incenatum* for *incenem*. Epid. 685, *quin conligas* for *quid conligas*. Merc. 248, *ad me Hoedus visu'st* for *Hoedus ad me visus est*. (A has HAEDVS.) Mil. 170, *foret* (so too Camerarius) for *fuerit*, the reading of BCD; 274, *malam rem* for *alium*, cf. Bentley to Phormio III 3, 11; 364, *proabri* for *propudij*, the reading of Camerarius; B has *prodivit*, C *prodit*, D *proditū*; 389, *meus mihī familiaris* for *familiaris meus mihī*; 554, *fatearis* for *fateare*, Ritschl keeps *fateare*, but Brix reads *fatearis*; 710, *habeo qui mī* for *habeo quom*, A has *mihī*, not *mī*. Poen. 357, *centiens* for *deciens*; 424, *abiturun'es* for *abiturusne es*. Pseud. 220, *nitidiusculum* for *nitidissimum*; 733, *nam hujus* for *nam unam hujus*; 866 and 867, *bonum animum* for *animum bonum*; 882, *suavi suavitate* for *suavitate*; 929, *eum esse* for *esse eum*, so too Hermann, Elem. Doctr. Metr. p. 207, and Bothe. Trin. 52, *bene valere* for *valere*, so Bothe; 350, *immuni* for *immunifico*, B *inmuni immunifcos*; 665, BCD have *imperium tuum ingenuum*, Bentley's text gave with Db *imperitum*, which Bentley changed to *ingenuum*. A has the same words, only transposed, *ingenium tuum ingenuum*. Truc. II, 2, 8, *inpudens* for *inprudens*.

It is remarkable how frequently Bentley has anticipated the emendations of

Bothe. Sonnenschein calls attention to this in his Appendix, p. 63, especially with reference to the *Menaechmi*, but it is no less true of other plays. In twelve plays I have observed more than fifty instances of agreement. Some of these I give below.

Bacch. 479, *potis* for *potest*. Capt. 431, *cave tu* for *caveto*; 965, *conpendi* for *conpendium*. Curc. 359, *pocum* for *poculum*, so too Goetz. Men. 214, *quoquetur* for *quoquitur*; 492, *med absente* for *meo absenti*; 499, *non nomen* for *nomen non*; 872, *morbum hercle* for *hercle morbum*. Merc. 183, *In' hinc dierectus nugaris* for *I hinc hodie dierectus a me!* *nugare*, Ritschl reads *Quin abi hinc dierectus, nugare*; 191, *nostris nos* (so too Lachmann and Ritschl) for *nos nostris*; 441, *mei animi* for *animi* (so too Scaliger). Mil. 282, *sci soli* for *scis solite*, Ritschl and Fleckeisen read *sci soli*, Brix and Lorenz following Haupt read *scias*; 1165, *nuptiarum*: PA. *omne ordine* for *summe Ordinis Nuptiarum*; 1193, *protinam* for *protinus*. Most. 237, *principe* for *principium*; 238, *his decem diebus* for *iisdem diebus*, *me isdec* B, *me isdem* CDb; 396, *ut animo sis* for *animo ut sis*. (Sonnenschein gives *ut sis animo*, which must be incorrect.) Persa. 324, *atque omne ego* for *atque ego omne*. Poen. 472, *pejeras* for *perjuras*. Pseud. 83, *adjuvas* for *adjutas*; 1073, *roga* for *rogato*.

We cannot attempt to give here all the passages in which Bentley and Ritschl hit upon the same devices for the healing of the text. The following may serve as specimens: Men. 85, *dum compediti aut anum*; Ritschl and Bentley insert *aut*, which is wanting in the MSS.; 340, *si quae* for *si qua*. Merc. 106, *Quid verbis opus est?* *emi eam*, etc., for *Quid verbis opu'st?* *emi*; 124, *enicat suspiritus* for *enicato suspiritus*; 312, *sum auctor ut* for *auctor sum uti*; 884, *porge* for *porrige*. Mil. 363, *praepropere* for *perpropere*; 601, *cautela locus* for *catē locus*, a conjecture which lay very near, but which Ritschl of modern editors was the first to propose; 752, the MSS. give *nam proletario sermone*, Ritschl and Bentley both omit the *nam*, which seems to have slipped in here from the following line. Most. 186, *doctam et bene te eductam* for *doctam te et bene eductam*; 373, *cedo bibam* for *cedo ut bibam*. Pseud. 1163, *habē'n argentum* for *habesne argentum*. Stich. 719, *quamvis desubito* for *quam vide subito*.

Some of the passages in which Fleckeisen's changes of the text coincide with Bentley's deserve attention. Amph. 227, *Pōstquam id actūmst, tubae utrūque contrā canunt* (cretic system), the MSS. give *canunt contra*, which Ussing retains, Fleckeisen and Bentley transpose; 377, *loquere, quid venisti?* for *eloquere*, etc. Capt. 86, Pareus, *sumus: quando res redierunt, molossici*, Bentley proposes *canēs sumus: quando redierunt, molōssici*, with Fleckeisen, or *quando res redeunt*. In Capt. 749 Bentley and Fleckeisen both transpose *hunc jam* of the MSS. so as to read, *Peristis, nisi jam hunc ē conspectu abducitis*. In Capt. 879 both read *meumne gnatum?* for *meum gnatum?* and transpose the words *facere oportet*. In Curc. 656, where the MSS. give *quem ego tibi*, Bentley proposes for the sake of the metre to read *quem tibi ego*, but Mahler, in his Dissertation "De Pronominum personalium apud Plautum collocatione," has proved that *ego* in Plautus regularly precedes the dat. *tibi*, and Goetz accordingly approves the reading of Guyet, *Hic est ego quem tibi misi natali die*. In Rud. 272, *Quedene ejectae ē mari simus anibae, opsecro*, Fleckeisen and Bentley agree in writing *simus* for *sumus*. Bothe keeps *sumus*.

Several passages might be cited where Bentley and Fleckeisen have made

use of transposition to remedy metrical defects. We pass, however, to the consideration of a few emendations where Bentley has anticipated other prominent critics of Plautus.

Asin. III 3, 139 (729), Pareus read: *Ego pes fui*, AR. *quín nec caput nec pes sermonis apparet*. Bothe and Fleckeisen both read *sermonum*. Seyffert in Philologus, Vol. XXVII, p. 440, has shown that Plautine usage requires *sermoni*, and here Ussing follows him. *Sermoni* now has Bentley's approval.

Capt. II 2, 71 (321 Fleck.), Pareus read: *Ne patri, tametsi unicus sum, decere videatur magis*, which is metrically false, as no one would think of scanning *decere*. For this reason Fleckeisen, with rather violent transposition, reads: *Né, tametsi unicus sum, magis decere videatúr patri*. Müller, in his "Plautinische Prosodie," p. 268, ingeniously proposes *esse e re for decere*, which, singularly enough, Bentley had thought of before him.

Capt. 807 (Brix 804), *Trím pístores scrófpasci, qui alunt furfuribús sues*, B has *furfure*. Bentley would change to *furfuri* or *furfuribus*. According to Schroeder, who is here much more exact than Sonnenschein, the latter change of *re* to *ribus* is in different ink, and was probably made later, thus representing the matured judgment of Bentley. With his fine metrical sense he doubtless felt that a trochaic septenarius ought not to end in a cretic word followed by an iambus, a rule now firmly established by Luchs in Studemund's Studien, Bd. I, p. 59. Luchs has also shown that the change to *furfuribus* is demanded by the sense as the singular of *furfur*, "apud veteres est integumentum unius grani." Cf. l. c., p. 57.

But it is time for us to turn to those emendations of Bentley which are peculiarly his own, inasmuch as no one since his time seems to have independently hit upon the same. Here, of course, for one who does not command the whole Plautine literature and does not possess all the older editions, it is impossible to affirm with certainty that no one has independently reached the same conclusions with Bentley. But the following will, we think, be new to most students of Plautus, and, if they do not all deserve adoption, they bear to such a degree the impress of their author's ingenuity and critical acumen as to be worthy of mention here. Lack of space forbids any discussion of the merits of each one.

Amph. 235 (Ussing 232), *Dénique ut voluimus, nóstra superát manus*. The MSS. have *volumus*, for which Bentley suggests *vovimus*. Asin. 261 (Us. 259), *Pícus et corníx ab laeva, córvus, parra ab dèxtera consuadent*, Bentley *consident*; 428, *dedo for dedi*; 508 (Us. 505), *Hócinest píeldtem colere, impérium matres mínuere*. MSS. and Pareus have *matris imperium*, Bentley *matri imperium*. Aul. 195, Bentley¹ *ornat* for *onerat*, which Wagner, Ussing and Benoist keep. 403, for *optati cives*, Bentley *pro Attici cives*, Ussing *opitulamini*. Bacch. 411, *perdít* for *perdidit*. Capt. 74, MSS. *Estne invocatum annon?* *planissime*, Bentley inserts *scortum* after *invocatum*, and so Sonnenschein. 797, *ad quemque ícero* for *ad quemcunque jecero*, so too Lindemann. 862, *Atque agnum adferri própere unum pínguem*. HE. *Cur?* ER. *Utsócrufices*, so Brix (859); the MSS. BJ have *proprium*; *proprítim*, Bentley's conjecture, is adopted by Sonnenschein. Cas. IV 3, 13 (680 Gep.), *Quo argumento?* OL. *Nimis tenax es*; Bentley's change to *Nimis*

¹ Francken, in his edition of the Aulularia, Groningen, 1877, reads *ornat*, and compares Pseud. II 3, 9 and Cas. III 3, 15.

sternax is very plausible. Cist. II 1, 25, for *Abi quaerere, Alibi quaere*. Curc. 413, Goetz reads *Libértus illius, quem omnes Summanim vocant*, Bentley *homines for omnes*. Men. 344, to avoid the synizesis of *navis* into one syllable, Bentley reads *nunc in istoc portu'st návis praedatória* for *portu stat*. Geppert also *est*. The last editor, Ussing, writes *nunc instat portu návis praedatória*. Men. 451, Bentley reads *Qui illum di deaeque omnes perdiunt primus qui commentus est*, which agrees very nearly with Luchs' proposal in Studemund's Studien, Bd. I, p. 31, based on Bothe and Loman, namely, *Qui illum di deaeque omnes perdant, primus qui commentus est*. Merc. 121, for *Quam maxime resisto tam res*, Bentley *Quam restito tam maxime res*. Mil. 456, for *fecisti Bentley sexti*. Ribbeck has, I believe, somewhere proposed *fexti* for this passage, all the recent editors read *fecit*. Mil. 604, BCD have *quippe scire sivere*, Camerarius read *quippe si resciverint*, for which Bentley *quippe enim si rescivere*. Most. 50, for *maneat Bentley mantat*. 204, for *suo* of the MSS. Bentley reads *suo sumtu*—thus *solam ille me soli sibi suo sumtu liberávit*, which is supported by the alliteration, and far better than Ritschl's *aere* or Fleckeisen's *argento*. Poen. I 2, 55 (262 Gep.), for *servilicolas, servolicolas*. II 1, 35 (473), for *indebant, indebam*. III 1, 35 (529), for *intu'st, non tuumst*. III 1, 67 (561), for *femina, flemina*—thus *Quin etiam deciderint vobis flemina in talis velim*. Cf. Epid. 670, *Lássitudine invaserunt misero ingenua flemina*, Geppert reads *fulmina*. III 2, 11 (579), for *commendo: quique tamen, quomodocumque*¹ *qui tamen*, Bentley with a *fortasse*. IV 2, 6 (818), for *latera forti ferro, catulo forti ferreo*. V 2, 153 (1101), Bentley for *ore aequae oculis, crine atque oculis*, with a reference to Horace C. I 32, 11, *Lycum nigris oculis nigroque crine decorum*. The same conjecture is found, according to Schroeder, in Bentley's copy of Gellius, XIII 30, 6. Poen. V 5, 11 (1279), Bentley deletes *que* and inserts *eam*, so as to read *Ita replebo eam átritate ut ábior multó siet*. Rud. 318, for *tortis superciliis, torvis, etc.* 1008 and 1009, *exugeri* and *exugeto* for *exurgeri* and *exurgeto*, which are, however, to be retained. Cf. Gloss. of Paulus Diaconus *Exurgentes, exprimentes*. Rud. 1210, for *tamen, tuum*. Trin. 1023, *surpuit* for *surrupuit*. Ritschl and Brix *surruperit*.

It remains for us to gather up some odds and ends from Bentley's marginal notes, the *raison d'être* of which it is not always easy to see. Amph. 777, he proposes *larvariarum* for *larvarum*; Aul. 634, *larviae* for *larvae*; Men. 449, *inhieto* for *hieto*; Bacch. 171 and 354, he reads *Epheson* for *Ephesum*, to avoid hiatus; Men. 301, 316, 471, Poen. 557, 1238, he shows a preference for the form *hercule* over *hercle* (also for metrical reasons). Truc. IV 4, 19, for *hos dies aliquos* he reads *hos dies aliquot*; so too according to Sonnenschein in Men. 950, *hos aliquot* for *aliquos*, with very small *t*, as though doubtfully. Schroeder gives no hint of a change in *aliquos*. Well known to scholars is Bentley's dictum, several times referred to in his edition of Terence, about *equidem*. Cf. to Hauton. Tim. IV 1, 19: "*Equidem per se valet ego quidem unde cum verbo personae primae semper ungebatur ante Neronis aetatem.*" Consistently with this theory he has changed *equidem* to *quidem* in Men. 309, 551, Mil. 656, Poen. 1229, Rud. 827 where the verb is not in the first person. John Kerr, a poor schoolmaster of Bentley's day, ventured to protest against this rule, but ineffectually, and only to excite Bentley's severe displeasure. Ritschl, too, was guided by it (cf. Opuscula, Vol.

¹ So too Koch in Fleckeisen's Neue Jarbücher, Vol. CVII, p. 241.

V, p. 333), but Ribbeck and Jordan, with the wrath of Bentley before their eyes, have had the courage to prove for all time the falsity of this opinion. *Equidem* undoubtedly was used by Plautus, Varro, Sallust and Livy with verbs of the second and third person.

In closing, we commend to all lovers of Plautus these emendations of Bentley as of more than passing interest, especially in the form given them by Herr Schroeder, and we wish him all success in the further prosecution of his project. We remember to have seen, in the National Library at Paris, two manuscripts purporting to contain emendations and notes of Scaliger to Plautus. Perhaps some one will be prompted to examine them, in the hope of finding some valuable suggestions of this remarkable scholar hitherto unpublished. The catalogue titles are, so far as we transcribed them, as follows:

8185. Codex Chartaceus, olim Puteanus. Ibi continentur: 1. Josephi Scaligeri Notae et Emendationes in Plautum. 2. Ejusdem variae lectiones in Isocratis Panathenaicum.

11305. Notes de Scaliger sur Plaute, 1594.

MINTON WARREN.

Origin and Growth of the Psalms. THOMAS CHALMERS MURRAY. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1880.

This book must add greatly to the regret felt by all who knew the author and his work, that he was not permitted to leave behind him a fuller record of his earnest scholarship. In the nature of the case, a volume like the present, consisting of lectures prepared for a general audience, can only indicate—it cannot demonstrate—the acuteness and learning its writer actually possessed. Yet the lectures are singularly adapted to their purpose. Their style is rapid and graceful. Opinions are stated clearly and freshly. Even the occasional diffuseness and repetition, which a strictly scientific purpose would have excluded, served, no doubt, to make the course effective. We must congratulate not only those who heard it, but also the larger public to whom it is now offered, on an introduction so suggestive, and in general so trustworthy, to the literary treasures of the Psalter. And while we wish, again and again, that we knew, as his students know, how he could support his positions by fully developed argument, and so get an insight into his methods as well as his results, and understand him better when we are forced to disagree, we may certainly be glad that the popular form secures to us some of those results which we should have lost without it. The two opening lectures, for example—on the Origin and History of the Shemitic Peoples, and the History of the Hebrew Language and Early Literature—are not exactly in place in a book with the present title, yet we should not be willing to spare them. They show how comprehensive, as well as acute, the writer's thought was, and, without accepting all their positions, we could not do without them in forming an estimate of him. Other paragraphs are scattered through the book, to which the same will apply. We instance only the sketch of Antiochus Epiphanes (pp. 113-118). They do not quite belong to the main topic, and a purely scientific examination of the Psalms would not have admitted them, but they furnish us with additional materials for judging the author's abilities. As it is, with all the incomplete-